



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/045,159	01/15/2002	C. Hudson Hendren III	06975-036002	9294

26171 7590 10/22/2004

FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
1425 K STREET, N.W.
11TH FLOOR
WASHINGTON, DC 20005-3500

EXAMINER

DINH, KHANH Q

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2151

DATE MAILED: 10/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/045,159

Applicant(s)

HENDREN, C. HUDSON

Examiner

Khanh Dinh

Art Unit

2151

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 July 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 24-54 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 24-54 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This is in response to the Reply to Action filed on 7/19/2004. Claims 44-54 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 24-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneider et al. US pat. No.6,105,027 in view of Blaszcak, US pat. No.6,615,255.

As to claim 24, Schneider discloses a method of providing information based on user comprehension characteristics of a user, the method comprising:

receiving data related to one or more on a user and selecting a message from a plurality of messages based upon the received data related to one or more of a user's information (access information divided into five broad categories from database, see abstract, figs.2, 3, col.7 line 42 to col.8 line 58), wherein the plurality of messages include a first message that corresponds to a first data related to a first set of user information (user identification 313 fig.3) and a second message that corresponds to a second data related to a second set of user information (trust information) and providing the message (see col.8 line 59 to col.10 line 54 and col.11 line 54 to col.12 line 65).

Art Unit: 2151

Schneider does not specifically disclose the data information based on level of technical proficiency. However, Blaszcak discloses the data information based on level of technical proficiency (providing a list of configuration objects to users according to users' proficiency, see abstract, figs.1, 3, col.1 lines 36-60, col.3 line 33 to col.4 line 60 and col.5 lines 10-46). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Blaszcak's message into the computer system of Schneider to exchange data information because it would have reduced the amount of data that has to be transmitted over the communication link between home and remote systems and thus prevented the user from misconfiguring the remote system (see Blaszcak's col.2 lines 2-48).

As to claim 25, Schneider discloses that a first computer (client of fig.2) providing the message and transmitting the message to a second computer (server of fig.2) (see fig.2, col.7 line 42 to col.8 line 58 and col.23 line 14 to col.24 line 56)

As to claim 26, Schneider discloses performing message selection at a client (see fig.2, col.15 line 31 to col.16 line 44 and col.23 line 14 to col.24 line 56).

As to claims 27, 31-33, 42, 43, Blaszcak discloses the data information based on level of technical proficiency (providing a list of configuration objects to users according to users' proficiency, see abstract, figs.1, 3, col.1 lines 36-60, col.3 line 33 to col.4 line 60 and col.5 lines 10-46). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Blaszcak's teachings into the computer system of Schneider

Art Unit: 2151

to exchange data information because it would have reduced the amount of data that has to be transmitted over the communication link between home and remote systems and thus prevented the user from misconfiguring the remote system (see Blaszcak's col.2 lines 2-48).

As to claims 28 and 29, Schneider discloses selecting a message based on one or more preferred languages of the user (see fig.5, col.17 line 45 to col.18 line 65 and col.21 line 15 to col.22 line 34).

As to claim 30, Schneider discloses the message comprising at least one of the following: text, graphics, video, animation, sound and instructions (i.e., displaying information in windows, see col.23 line 14 to col.24 line 67).

As to claim 34, Schneider discloses receiving an HTTP (Hyper Text Transfer Protocol) indicator at the first computer in response to a user's HTTP request for a URL (Universal Resource Locator) provided by the second computer (see fig.3, col.3 line 32 to col.4 line 63 and col.8 line 59 to col.9 line 67).

As to claim 35, Schneider discloses an apparatus for providing a message based on user comprehension characteristics comprising:

a data receiver arranged and structured so as to receive data related to one or more user information (access information divided into five broad categories from database, see abstract, figs.2, 3, col.7 line 42 to col.8 line 58).

a data store (206 fig.2) arranged and structured so as to store a plurality of messages wherein the plurality of messages include a first message that corresponds to a first data related to a first set of user information (user identification 313 fig.3), a second message that corresponds to a second data related to a second set user information (Trust information) and a first computer that selects a message from the plurality of messages and provides the message (see col.8 line 59 to col.10 line 54 and col.11 line 54 to col.12 line 65).

Schneider does not specifically disclose the data information based on level of technical proficiency. However, Blaszcak discloses the data information based on level of technical proficiency (providing a list of configuration objects to users according to users' proficiency, see abstract, figs.1, 3, col.1 lines 36-60, col.3 line 33 to col.4 line 60 and col.5 lines 10-46). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Blaszcak's message into the computer system of Schneider to exchange data information because it would have reduced the amount of data that has to be transmitted over the communication link between home and remote systems and thus prevented the user from misconfiguring the remote system (see Blaszcak's col.2 lines 2-48).

Claims 36 and 37 are rejected for the same reasons set forth in claims 27 and 29 respectively.

Claim 38 is rejected for the same reasons set forth in claim 1. As to the added limitations, Schneider further discloses receiving an indicator (indication 311 fig.3) and providing the message to a computer (fig.3, col.8 line 59 to col.9 line 67).

Art Unit: 2151

Claims 39-41 are rejected for the same reasons set forth in claims 26, 28 and 31 respectively.

As to claims 44-47 and 52-54, Schneider discloses that a message is performed at an intervening agent between a client computer and a server computer, a proxy server, a network status indicator and a web page (see Schneider's summary, figs.2, 3, col.21 line 15 to col.22 line 62 and col.25 lines 1-60).

Claims 48-51 are rejected for the same reasons set forth in claims 45, 46, 28, 29 and 29 respectively.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed on 7/19/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

- Applicant asserts that the Blaszcak reference does not disclose or suggest using data related to a user's technical proficiency.

*Examiner respectfully disagrees. Examiner point out that Blaszcak discloses providing a list of configuration objects to users according to users' proficiency. By maintaining a copy of each remote configuration logic object at the home location, the computer system could identify users with different **technical proficiency** and select the proper stored configuration logic object for a particular remote location/user (see abstract, figs.1, 3, col.1 lines 36-60, col.3 line 33 to ocl.4 line 60 and col.5 lines 10-46). Applicant is noted that the claimed subject matter, not the specification is the measure of the invention.*

Limitations in the specification cannot be read into the claims for the purpose of avoiding the prior art. See In re Self, 213 USPQ 1,5 (CCPA 1982); In re Priest, 199 USPQ 11, 15 (CCPA 1978). The Examiner has a duty and responsibility to the public and to Applicant to interpret the claims as broadly as reasonably possible during prosecution (see In re Prater, 56 CCPA 1381, 415 F.2d 1393, 162 USPQ 541 (1969)).

Therefore, the examiner asserts that cited prior art teaches or suggests the subject matter broadly recited in independent claims 24, 35 and 38. Claims 25-34, 36, 37 and 39-54 are also rejected at least by virtue of their dependency on independent claims and by other reasons set forth in the previous office action. Accordingly, claims 24-54 are respectfully rejected.

Conclusion

5. Claims 24-54 are **rejected**.
6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2151

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Khanh Dinh whose telephone number is 703-308-8528. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zarni Maung, can be contacted at (703) 308-6687. The Official fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned to be (703) 872-9306

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-9600.

Khanh Dinh

Examiner

Art Unit 2151

October 15, 2004


ZARNI MAUNG
PRIMARY EXAMINER